## **EXHIBIT C**

Case 2:06-cr-00550-JS-AKT Document 1766-2 Filed 11/27/13 Page 7 of 26 PageID #: 18080

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK - X UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 06-CR-550 -against-United States Courthouse Central Islip, New York DAVID BROOKS, July 18, 2013 4:40 p.m. Defendant. TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOANNA SEYBERT UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE APPEARANCES: For the Government: LORETTA E. LYNCH **United States Attorney** 100 Federal Plaza Central Islip, New York 11722 BY: MARSHALL MILLER Assistant United States Attorney For the Defendant: BY: RICHARD GREENBERG, ESQ. TAI PARK, ESQ. STEVEN YUROWITZ, ESQ. Perry Auerbach Court Reporter: 100 Federal Plaza Central Islip, New York 11722 (631) 712-6103 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer.

> Perry Auerbach, CSR, RPR Official Court Reporter

2 1 THE COURT: This is Judge Seybert. 2 THE CLERK: Also appearing for the defendant. 3 MR. PARK: Yes, Tai Park from Park and Jensen. 4 Good afternoon, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Good afternoon to you both. 6 MR. GREENBERG: And with me from my office is 7 Peter Yurowitz, who's one of my partners, he's been 8 actively involved in the defense of Mr. Brooks in most of 9 the matters. 10 MR. YUROWITZ: Good afternoon, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Good afternoon. What I suggest is 12 that Mr. Greenberg, either you speak or Mr. Yurowitz can 13 speak on this issue in addition to Mr. Park, and you 14 should of course state your name when you begin to speak. 15 For the government, please, 16 MR. MILLER: Yes. Marshall Miller for the 17 government. 18 THE COURT: All right. Gentlemen, I got you all 19 on the line today for purposes of discussing this recent 20 correspondence and the filing of the government of their letter on ECF, public filing, and the response from you, 21 22 Mr. Greenberg, which was also filed shortly thereafter. 23 I want to disclose to you that I called 24 Mr. Miller this afternoon when I received the 25 correspondence and asked him to make inquiry of two items:

One, why wasn't I contacted respecting the notice that was going to be made. I had been contacted regarding the investigation by way of the marshal service.

Additionally, I wanted to know -- and most importantly -- why the document was publicly filed and if it was going to be publicly filed, why there was no mention that the government's investigation did not disclose that these threats were substantiated. If not, that the threats were found to be unfounded or could not be substantiated, words to that effect.

Mr. Miller, you indicated that you would get back to me. I would like to get something done on this, because I don't necessarily think that it should remain on the public docket and first I would ask defense counsel, are you willing to waive your client's appearance for purposes of this proceeding?

MR. GREENBERG: Absolutely, your Honor. We are willing to waive, we do waive Mr. Brooks and we with do waive Mr. Brooks' appearance.

THE COURT: And so do you, Mr. Park?

MR. YUROWITZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, Mr. Miller, if you would be good enough to tell me what, if anything, you're going to do with regard to this public filing?

MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor. We're going to augment the public filing with an additional filing if the Court deems that to be appropriate. It would make clearer that to date we have not been able to corroborate or substantiate the allegations in a way that would enable us to credit it.

THE COURT: All right. And additionally, let me ask you, is it your general procedure to file these types of letters on a public docket?

MR. MILLER: Well, your Honor, we have been working at the suggestion really of the Court to be sure that our practice -- and I don't mean by the Court, your Honor, I mean the Court more generally, and particularly the Chief Judge to ensure that our practice in requesting that these matters be maintained under seal, that we do so in accordance with Second Circuit law regarding whether a compelling interest overrides the public's First Amendment, the media's First Amendment, qualified First Amendment right of access to request documents, and it was the assessment of the AUSAs who had been working, separate AUSAs who had been working on this threat allegation that there was a basis under the Second Circuit case law to file it under seal.

So that's why it was filed publicly.

THE COURT: Perhaps the better procedure would

5 be to alert the Court and defense counsel of this 1 2 potential filing rather than have letters going back and 3 forth. 4 Let me ask Mr. Greenborg and Mr. Park. what. if 5 anything, do you have to say with respect to this issue? 6 MR. GREENBERG: Well, your Honor this is Richard 7 Greenberg, I appreciate Mr. Miller's letter --8 THE COURT: You have to speak up a little bit 9 louder. 10 MR. GREENBERG: I appreciate the government's 11 desire to help remedy this situation. I did try to find 12 out my best to --13 THE COURT: You're not speaking loudly enough. 14 sir. MR. GREENBERG: I'll speak louder, I'm not on a 15 speaker I'm on -- I'll speak more loudly. Anyway, I think 16 17 what Mr. Sinclair is suggesting was what I suggested to 18 Mr. Sinclair, something that supplements or corrects the 19 filing, because I anticipate headlines about Brooks' 20 attempting to kill the judge, that's why I got the letter 21 in as quickly as I could and I'm glad that you received it 22 already. I think that something along the lines it's not 23 only appropriate but required that, something that says 24 that they have no credible evidence to support this 25 allegation.

R

Now, I know government never wants to say it's over, they want to always hold out the possibility there's something more, and I understand that, but for now Mr. Sinclair made it clear to me and to Mr. Park and Mr. Shargel yesterday that they have no basis to believe the allegations as of now, and that all I was hoping to convince Mr. Sinclair to say, but he refused because he felt the letter that they did file was clear enough.

But I didn't think it was, and I hope the government now agrees that something else must be said to clarify the situation, because certainly I want the Court to know, I want the government to know, I certainly want these lawyers who are threatened, apparently nobody thought I was one of them, I'm happy to hear that, but I want everybody to know there was no basis, no credible basis for this allegation and the government has determined that so far.

So that's really all I had to say. I don't know if Mr. Park has something else.

MR. PARK: Your Honor, the only, and this is really addressed to Mr. Miller as well, the one thing that I do believe Mr. Sinclair said during our conversation today which was helpful, that was the words that he used was that they had determined that the source of the allegation would not be credited.

Now, that is a different way of saying they have found no credible evidence, but in some ways I would ask that that augment, when there is an augmentation that that additional information be included because it does go to the fact that ultimately whoever made these allegations, ultimately the government concluded should not be credited, and I think that's even a slightly stronger way of saying that there is no current credible evidence supporting the allegation, and I would ask for that augmentation as well.

THE COURT: Mr. Miller, is that possible?

MR. MILLER: I'm certainly happy to work with counsel to craft some language that both accurately conveys the government's position and tries to address the concerns that I am hearing and that I understand, and I want to make sure that I do so in a way that accurately attaches the record, but perhaps we can work together when in phone call is done to come up with language that will accurately convey the government's position and do so in a way that takes care of the problems and concerns. We can get there I'm confident.

THE COURT: Certainly in the future I would expect that I would get some preliminary notice on matters such as this.

MR. GREENBERG: Your Honor, on that part, if I

R

pay just respond on the very point you just made.

The letter was addressed not to the Court but to counsel, Mr. Park and me. I cannot believe that the Chief Judge of the Eastern District or anybody else in the court system requires communication between counsel to be made a matter of public record.

And certainly your Honor's suggestion that there be a heads-up for the Court and whoever else is relevant before something is publicly filed is a wise one, it's a good idea.

I mean, this is going to have repercussions in the press I would predict. I was hoping my letter would resolve it, but I fear the worst. And it's a seemingly -- I'm sure --

THE COURT: Mr. Greenberg, I'm sorry, sir, but we have a court reporter here and you are on a speakerphone for purposes of the record. So if you would be good enough just to repeat your last sentence.

MR. GREENBERG: My last sentence was simply I feel your Honor's point is well-taken, there should be notice in the future, this is the second time, I'm not blaming the government or accusing the government. These are understandable kinds of inadvertent mistakes, but this is the second time that something was prematurely publicly filed and had to either be removed from the public filing

or corrected, and I hope that in a high profile case like this the government will use particularly sensitive judgment about what needs to be filed. I'm sure that they will try.

MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor, we do try.

It is our position that this issue is one where whatever the style of notice, we felt that it was important that there be a clear record in the court file that notice was given at appropriate time, we think that's important for all the parties that such notice be given in a manner that is recorded, because it's important for the record and given that we felt that it had to be recorded in the case file, we looked into case law on sealing and we didn't feel that the information -- that there was a basis under the Second Circuit case law to seal it.

So that is the government's position, and I understand your Honor's point, without preliminary notice, we will never file that preliminary notice in the future so that the Court can manage that process.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right.

Mr. Greenberg and Mr. Park, should I be expecting any motion to recuse the Court?

MR. GREENBERG: I certainly don't believe so, your Honor, now the government has clarified it, I don't see why the Court should be affected by a baseless

10 1 allegation. 2 THE COURT: And the Court has not been affected by the allegations that were made. So I put that on the 3 4 record, and unless I hear to the contrary, I will continue 5 preparation on this case for sentence August the seventh. 6 MR. GREENBERG: As we are, your Honor, 7 preparing, the person that I was concerned about is Mr. Shargel, whether he would have felt some reason to, 8 9 but I think, I hope, he's not in touch today actually, but 10 I do hope that now the government is willing to acknowledge that the allegations so far has proven 11 12 unsupportable, that he will feel no reason to have the 13 court withdraw. All right. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Greenberg and Mr. Park, please 15 let me know as soon as you know after speaking to 16 Mr. Brooks and Mr. Shargel, whether any motion will be 17 forthcoming so that I can appropriately respond to it. 18 Other than that, I will see you folks on August 7th. 19 MR. GREENBERG: Yes, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Have a good day. 21 MR. MILLER: Mr. Park, Mr. Greenberg, if one of 22 you can call me in about five minutes I'm sure I can draft 23 up the language. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 (Matter concluded.)